

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed January 1, 2007 has been carefully considered.

Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Abstract has been amended to conform to proper format. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8 - 11 have been amended.

Support for these changes is found in the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit therefore that the amendments do not add new matter.

With this amendment it is respectfully submitted the claims satisfy the statutory requirements.

The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1 - 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Deneroff¹. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended is not anticipated by Deneroff. Claim 1 includes the following limitations.

A memory module comprising:

a printed circuit board having a plurality of connector pins;

a plurality of different types of memory devices mounted on said printed circuit board;

and

an electrical circuit coupling said plurality of memory devices to said plurality of connector pins such that said plurality of connector pins has multiple functionality based on a respective architecture of each of said plurality of different types of memory devices.

(Amended claim 1) (Emphasis added)

¹ U.S. Patent No. 6,115,278

Applicants respectfully submit that Dneroff does not contain the limitation of a plurality of different types of memory devices mounted on a printed circuit board with an electrical circuit coupling the plurality of memory devices to the plurality of connector pins such that said plurality of connector pins has multiple functionality based on the respective architecture of each of the plurality of memory devices.

Further, applicants respectfully submit that Deneroff does not suggest such a limitation.

For these reasons applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Deneroff.

Given that all of the claims, as amended, include the limitations as discussed above, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 – 11 are, likewise, not anticipated or rendered obvious by Deneroff.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.


If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID BROWN
RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP

Dated: 4/2/07


Thomas Van Zandt
Reg. No. 43,219

Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040